DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 125 CG 002 972

By-Krebs, Richard L.
Girls--More Moral Than Boys or Just Sneakier?
American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Sep 68
Note-7p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, September 1968.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
Descriptors-Behavior Rating Scales, *Grade 6, *Moral Values, Research, *Sex Differences, *Student Behavior, *Teacher Attitudes

This research was undertaken to check on the existence of the impression that teachers do see girls as more moral than boys, and to assess the accuracy of the teachers' perceptions. A random sample of sixth grade children was selected from 10 classes in a middle class and a working class school to fit a balanced factorial design with two factors, sex and social class. The groups were controlled for I.Q. Teachers rated the subjects on three scales of morality: (1) trustworthiness, (2) obedience, and (3) respect for others' rights. To assess the accuracy of the teachers' perceptions the behavioral measures of morality employed were Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Inventory, and three cheating tests. Teachers were found to view girls as more moral than boys, but the teachers' viewpoint was not supported by behavioral evidence. The possible causes of this discrepancy are discussed. (PS)

ED 030125

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ED 002 972

GIRLS-MORE MORAL THAN BOYS OR JUST SNEAKIER?

Richard L. Krebs, Ph.D.
Sinai Hospital of Baltimore

Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting
San Francisco, September, 1968

"Sugar and spice and everything nice...." the cultural stereotype of girls being good and boys, bad is part of our folk lore. In talking with teachers and reading the education literature (Terman and Tyler, 1946, Meyer and Thompson, 1956) one gets the impression that teachers are strongly influenced by this stereotype. The following research was undertaken both to check on the existence of the impression that teachers do see girls as more moral than boys and also to assess the accuracy of the teachers' perceptions.

A random sample of sixth grade children was selected from ten classes in a middle class and a working class school to fit a balanced factorial design with two factors, sex and social class. The boys and girls groups were controlled for I. Q. The I.Q. scores were obtained from the school records and were based on standardized group intelligence tests. While the design called for 132 Ss only 127 Ss were obtained. (Five working class boys were lost during the study).

To assess the influence of the cultural stereotype on the teachers' perceptions of boys and girls, teachers were asked to rate the Ss on three scales of morality previously used by Kohlberg (1958): Trustworthiness, Obedience, and Respect for Others' Rights.

To assess the accuracy of the teachers' perceptions two behavioral measures of morality were employed: Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Inventory and three cheating tests. Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Inventory uses a series of ten hypothetical moral dilemmas to identify a child's level of moral judgment. This level of moral judgment has in turn been found to be related to other indicies of morality such as non-delinquency.

The three cheating tests consisted of an individual test and two group tests. In the individual cheating test the Ss played a ray gun and a model house game, while the experimenter sat at a table some distance from the game working on some papers. The ray gun game was similar to the one developed by Grinder and consisted of a revolving target that the subject tried to shoot with a ray gun. In the model house game the subject was supposed to arrange furniture in a series of rooms.

If the subject obtained a score of 25 points in the games he received a prize; a sharp shooter's medal for the ray gun game and an I.D. bracelet for the model house game. Each subject recorded his own score. The games had been programmed so that it was necessary to cheat in order to win the prize.

The two group tests were adaptions of Hartshourne and May's Improbible Achievment Tests. The first of the two tests consisted of rows small circles in which the subject was supposed to write the numbers one throught ten with his eyes closed. While the children took the test, the experimenter stood with his back to the class and look at the clock on the wall to time the test. On the second group test the subject was given a sheet of paper with drawings of blocks piled on top of one another. The subject was supposed to decide how many blocks were touching a block with an "x" on it and write that number next to the "x". At the end of the test a confident called the experimenter out of the room for three minutes. In both the individual and group testing situations the experimenter appeared indifferent to the child's behavior and made no clear demands beyond a brief explanation of the rules of the games.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows that on the teacher ratings of morality, girls were rated as more moral than boys on all three scales for both middle class and working class children.

Turning to the behavioral indicies of morality we find that on Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Inventory, Table II, girls were not more moral than boys. In fact, in the middle class group, boys were more moral than girls.

Table III shows that there were no significant differences between middle class boys and girls on the three cheating tests. Table III indicates that in the working class group girls were more moral than boys on one of the three cheating tests.

The results suggest that teachers do view girls as more moral than boys, but the teachers' viewpoint is not supported by behavioral evidence. The latter results are in general agreement with previous research on differential moral behavior in boys and girls. Most previous researchers have found no difference in cheating behavior in boys and girls (Mutterer, 1965, Nelson etal, 1967, Burton etal, 1961, Johnson, 1943) Hartshorne and May, 1928-30) did find a few cases in which boys were more honest than girls and girls gave more service to other people than boys did.

If girls are not more moral than boys why do teachers persist in thinking that they are?

One possible explanation is that girls are more conforming than boys. Terman and Tylers' review (1946) indicates that girls have lower delinquency rates than boys and they get into less trouble at home and at school than boys do. Apparently, girls conform to external adult standards better than boys do. However, when these standards are not clearly indicated by an authority, as is the case in both the moral judgment inventory and the cheating tests, girls do not act any more morally than boys.

I addition to needing clearly definded standards it is also possible that girls respond more to the apparent interest of the authority than boys do. Hartshorne and May (1928) found that girls cheated more than boys when the tests were of the take-home variety. Mutterer (1965) found that girls cheated more on tests when the rewards were made publicly than they did when the rewards were made in private, while boys cheated at the same rate regardless of the way the reward was presented. Girls perform less well, when they are responding to an authority who appears disinterested and is not making clear demands.

Apparently, girls do look better than boys do when the teacher is present and making demands but teachers have mistakenly assumed that girls are generally more moral than boys; that they are more moral not only when the teacher is present but also when she is absent. Not only when she is concerned about her students behavior, but also when she is disinterested.

If this were the end of the proposed causal chain then the research would not have been of much importance. I would have had a neat little study that showed that teachers have been falsely influenced by a cultural stereotype and by the overt behavior of their students. Teachers have assumed girls are more moral when in fact they are only more conforming. However, the research of Ausubel (1954) has suggested that there may be another step in the causal chain. Fourth and fifth grade girls see themselves as more accepted and intrinsically worthwhile than boys do. Katz and Zigler also found similar results in fifth grade children regarding a discrepency between real self and self as seen by others. There are two ways to interpret the fact that boys have lower self-esteem than girls do. Perhaps the message has been getting through to the children and the stereotype of boys is less moral than girls, is being perpetuated by the teachers at the cost of lowered self-esteem in boys. Another interpretation is suggested by the work of Zigler who found that feelings about the self are related to increased maturity. He found that there was a decrease in the relationship between the real self and the ideal self with increased age.

As children get older they realize that they aren't what they want to be. This increased discrepency is apparently related both to an increase ideal self (i.e. -- higher standards) and increased cognative differentiation.

If Zigler's analysis is correct then perhaps the causal chain should not go from teacher to student but rather from student to teacher. It is possible that the boys' lowered self-esteem reflects his greater maturity in this developmental variable and the teacher is responding to the boys' lowered self-esteem rather than creating it.

The question of causation cannot really be answered by this study. However, the study does raise interesting questions about the nature of the relationship between transmitted cultural stereotypes, moral behavior and self perceptions in children.

TABLE 1

Teacher Ratings of Morality-Middle Class Subjects

Scale	N	$\bar{X}$	S2	t	P
Trustworthiness-BOYS-	33	11.26	10.22		
	GIRLS-33	22.39	10.32	10.91	<.001
Obedience	BOYS- 33	12.63	11.88		
	GIRLS-33	23.83	10.48	13.49	<.001
Respect for	BOYS- 33	8.77	8.21		
other Rights	GIRLS-33	15.50	10.13	6.94	<.001

Teacher Ratings of Morality-Working Class Subjects

Scale	N	$\bar{X}$	S2	t	P
Trustworthiness-BOYS-	28	20.88	18.73		
	GIRLS33	41.52	25.00	13.58	<.001
Obedience	BOYS -28	18.53	12.57		
	GIRLS-33	23.27	9.95	5.27	<.001
Respect for	BOYS -28	16.32	12.24		
Others Rights	GIRLS-33	20.18	11.24	4.20	<.001

TABLE 2

Behavioral Indicies of Morality- Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Inventory

Scale	N	$\bar{X}$	S2	t	P
Middle Class	BOYS -33	278	11.36		
	GIRLS-33	263	9.91	4.54	<.001
Working Class	BOYS -28	243	7.21		
	GIRLS-33	256	6.14	.40	N.S.

TABLE 3

Behavioral Indicies of Morality-Cheating Tests-Middle Class

Scale	N	$\bar{X}$	S2	t	P
Individual Test	BOYS -33	4.88	10.62		
	GIRLS-33	5.17	13.56	.26	N.S.
Group Test-	BOYS -33	5.94	4.81		N.S.
Circles	GIRLS-33	7.94	5.83	1.10	
Group Test	BOYS -33	10.55	3.48		
Blocks	GIRLS-33	10.49	4.15	.08	N.S.

Behavioral Indicies of Morality-Cheating Tests-Working Class

Scale	N	$\bar{X}$	S2	t	P
Individual Test	BOYS-28	5.47	10.65		
	GIRLS33	2.31	8.14	5.45	<.001
Group Test-	BOYS-28	6.47	6.30		
Circles	GIRLS33	5.97	2.83	.94	N.S.
Group Test	BOYS-28	10.80	3.99		
Blocks	GIRLS33	11.17	3.94	.76	N.S.

REFERENCES

Ausubel, D., Perceived parents' attitudes as determinants of children's ego structures. Child Development, 1954, 25, 173-83.

Burton, R. V. Maccoby, Eleanor, E., Allinsmith W. Antecedants of Resistance to temptation in four-year-old children, Child Development, 1961, 32, 689-710.

Grinder, R. E. New techniques for research in children's temptation behavior. Child Development, 1961, 32, 679-688.

Grinder, R. E. Parental Childrearing Practices, conscience, and resistance to temptation of sixth grade children. Child Development, 1962, 33, 803-820.

Harthshone, H., & May, M. Studies in the nature of character. New York: MacMillan, 1928-30.

Johnson, L. Pupil cheating. Education Digest, 1943, 9, 32-32.

Katz, P. & Zigler, E. Self-image dispairity: A developmental approach, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, Vol. 5, No. 2, 186-195.

Kohlberg, L. The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years ten to sixteen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

Krebs, R. Some relationships between moral judgment, attention and resistance to temptation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967.

Meyer, W., & Thompson, G. The differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth grade children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 385-96.

Mutterer, M. Factors affecting the specificity of preadolescents' behavior in a variety of temptation situations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Nelson, E., Grinder, R., & Howard, J. Resistance to temptation and moral judgment: behavioral correlates of Kohlberg's measure of moral development. Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development, New York, March, 1967.

Terman, L., & Tyler, L. Psychological sex difference. In L. Carmichael (Ed.), Manual of Child Psychology. New York: John Wiley (1946).